THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

By

Rodney Lee Wells.

****
*****
***
*

Presented as Partial Requirement
for the Degree of Master
of Arts.

DRAKE UNIVERSITY.

1 9 1 8.

THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

CONTENTS.

b.Restricted manumission. Why?

4.The manumitted negro and his status.

a.Neither bond nor free.

5.Manumitted negro persona non grata.

a.Fear of slave insurrections.
b.Free negro a menace to slave property.

6.Manumission a panacea.

Chapter III. Antecedents and Organization Of The American Colonization society.

1.The colonization scheme was not an innovation of the nineteeth century.

2.Plans of the Quakers, Anthony Benezet, Thomas Brangan, Samuel Hopkins, Dr. Thornton, Jefferson and others.

3.Virginia and her plans.

4.Dr.Finley the founder of the Society.

5.Organization of the Society, 1816.

a.First Meeting.
b.Second meeting and organization at Washington.
c.Purpose of the Society--colonize free blacks.

6.The Society and the Government.

a.Memorial to Congress.
b.Action of Congress favorable.

Chapter IV. The Colonization Society In Africa.

1.The Society's quest for territory.

2.Purchase of recaptured slaves.

3.The Act of March 3,1819.

4.The Society's first venture--"Mayflower of Liberia."

a.Failure of the first expedition.

5.Second expedition,1821.

a.Purchase of territory.
b.Hostility of the natives.

6.Definite establishment of the colony,1822.

Chapter V. Founding Of The Commonwealth Of Liberia.

1.Distress of the colonists,1822.

a.Rev.Jedhudi--character--work.
b.Sickness and dissention.
c.Attacks by the natives.

2.Aid from the United States.

3.State Societies-value and weakness.

4.Progress of the Society in the colony.

5.The Colony's relation to foreign powers.

a.Disputes with England.
b.Position in International Law.

6. Liberia independent,1847.

Chapter VI. Permanent Results of Colonization.

1.Recognition of Liberia by the Powers.

2.Liberian political life and leaders.

3.Diplomacy sadly deicient.

a.English loan of 1870.
b.Aggressions of the French.

4.The Liberian Commission to the United States.

5.The United States Commission to Liberia.

6.The Commission's report. Result.

Chapter VII. An Estimation Of The Colonization Society.

1.Sectional prejudice shown in views.

2.Opposition of the free negroes.

3.The Society not a missionary enterprise.

4.The Society as,"disguised abolition."

5.The relation of the Society to slavery.

6.Number of free negroes colonized.

7.Cost of colonization.

8.Liberia a monument of the Colonization Society.

THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction of Slavery into the United States.

History, from the day in which it was spoken, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread",[1] teaches, "that the indolent, the crafty, and the strong, unmindful of human rights, have ever sought to evade this divine decree by filching their bread from the constrained and unpaid toil of others",[2] and that it "does not go back to a time when slavery was not sustained by civil society and enforced by laws. No matter what may have been the form of its government or the character of its religious faith,--Pagan, Jewish, Hindoo, or Christian, -- every state, kingdom and empire of which we have any account has at some time cherished slavery as a social element."[3] Its origin is usually referred "to war --- to the captivity of the vanquished and to the thrift and clemency of the victor, who learns by experience that the gratification of killing his prisoner is transient, while the profit of sparing him for servitude is enduring. ....."[4]

In the light of the foregoing, it is a cause neither for wonder nor censure that slavery, reenforced by

1. Gen., 3;19.
2. Wilson--Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America,1.
3. Emory Washburn--Slavery as it once prevailed in Massachusetts--Lowell Institute Lecture,193.
4. Greeley, Vol. 1.24.

economic conditions and championed by the wise men of the ages, should have found in the New World such a ready and kindly reception. Rather should we marvel that friend and foe alike united their efforts to devise and carry out a plan for colonizing the unfortunate victims of this "social element". That we may better understand the factors which made the Colonization Society possible, a brief survey of the development of slavery in the United States is necessary.

That slavery early took root and flourished in the New World, especially along the Atlantic sea-board, is quite evident from chance references made to it in the chronicles of adventurers. Among the rather numerous and variegated sins laid at the door of Sir William Hawkins, is that of being the parent of the slave trade. This charge is due, perhaps, to his several expeditions to the African coast. In one of his forays on the Guinea Coast, he admits, "we landed 150 men, hoping to obtain some Negroes, where we gatte but few."[1] Evidently Queen Elizabeth considered the opening of the slave trade such a worthy achievement as to warrant her knighting him and granting as his crest the device of a Negro's head and bust with arms bound.[2] This charge that Hawkins was the "father of the slave trade",

1. Hart--Am. Hist. Told by Contemp. 1,No. 38.
2. Brawley--Hist of the American Negro,3; Fiske--Old Virginia and her Neighbors, 15-18, "a demi-Moor proper bound with a cord."

is unverified, but rather Columbus and his Spanish brethren are the authors of slavery and the slave trade as far as the United States is concerned.[1]

"The great name of Columbus, "says Greeley, "is indelibly soiled and stained by undeniable and conspicuous implication in the enslavement of the Aborigines of this continent."[2] In his record of the third voyage of Columbus, Las Casas remarks that on "August 8, a canoe came with 12 men to the caravel.... and from them he (Columbus) chose six and sent the others to the land...it not appearing to him that it was an injustice and an offense against God and his neighbor to take free men against their will.."[3] Later this same Las Casas suggested the importation of blacks in order to alleviate the unhappy lot of the fast disappearing red-man, for the first slaves were Indians.[4] This policy of sparing the Indians at the expense of the Africans appealed to the Dominican clergy, although they differed with Las Casas in that they thought it more expedient to import the Africans direct from their native land rather than from Spain.[5] Columbus realized that

1. Channing I, 115-16.
2. Greeley, I, 27.
3. Original Narratives of Early American History, 343-44.
4. Winsor--Spanish Explorations and Settlements in America, II, 298-331. Later, having witnessed the evil results of his suggestion, Las Casas repented and says he was laboring "under a deep mist and delusion," at the time he made the suggestion. He was the first abolitionist.
5. Bourne--Spain in America, Chap.XVIII. White slaves were common in the West Indies.

if he could not satisfy the Spanish greed for gold that he would lose the support of the home government, for it was reported that Columbus's Indies were goldless. His only salvation, as he saw it, was to bolster up his declining fortunes by sending home Indian slaves to fill up the deficiency.[1] While Spain frowned upon slavery on the Continent and freed the Indians sent by Columbus, yet she countenanced it in the Indies. Thus slavery begun in the New World almost as early as the discovery of America.

The popular date for the beginning of slavery in the United States proper is 1619 and the stigma for its introduction is generously accorded to the Dutch. For what little we know concerning the matter we are indebted to John Rolfe, the "most famous squaw-man in history," who tells us that a "dutch man of warre," put in at Jamestown and "sold us twenty Negars."[2] "This ship", says Spears, "Was probably the first slave-trader to visit what is now the coast of the United States.,....There is an old record containing the names of some of the slaves she landed; but her name and the name of her commander have been lost beyond recovery."[3]

As to this "dutch man of warre," instigating

1. Basset-Short History of the Unites States, 30; Bourne, 38--9.
2. Smith--General Historie, Bk. IV. 337. In a letter signed, "By me, John Rolf."
3. Spears--The American Slave Trade, 3.

the trade, there is some doubt. Early in the summer the Treasurer, an English vessel, was commissioned by the "rapacious and unscrupulous" Argall and set sail for the West Indies, presumedly to secure a cargo of salt and goats, but her real object was slaves.[1] Her log shows that she fell in with a Dutch vessel and the general supposition is that, being fearful of vengeance at the hands of the Spanish for cruising in their waters, she transferred her cargo to the Dutchman.[3] It is rather a noteworthy fact that so near in time the Mayflower "with its freight of learning and Christian civilization," and the other, "with its ill-starred burden of wretchedness and woe," should have unloaded their cargoes on the shores of America.

In Virginia and the south, nature seemed to lend itself to the furtherance of slavery. The climate, according to the renowned John Smith in "The sommer is hot as in Spain; the winter colde as in Fraunce or England," but he adds that, "While the cold is extreame sharpe --- no extreame long continueth."[3] Another writer tells us "the ayre and clymate is most sweet and wholesome".[4] The

1. Bruce--Econ. Hist of Virginia, I,66. The vessel was sent by the Earl of Warwick and its commission was from the Duke of Savoy, who at that time was at war with Spain. The Treasurer returned late in the summer of 1619 with one slave, a woman--Angela.
2. Spears, 5--6.
3. Smith, Generall History, Bk. N, 337.
4. Records of the Columbia Hist. Soc., Vol. II, 110.

climate of the Southland was ideal, for the Negro thrives under a hot sun, quite immune from the terrible malaria. So well, indeed, did the Negro withstand a hot climate and its accompanying fevers that Herrera, an early Spanish writer says, "it was the opinion that unless a negro should happen to be hung he would never die, for as yet none had been known to perish from infirmity."[1]

In regard to the richness of the soil Captain Newport writes, "The sohle is more than fertill than can well be exprest."[2] In similar fashion the principal products of the South were peculiarly adapted to slave labor. The methods used in the production of maize, rice, tobacco and cotton did not require the intelligence or the care so essential to successful manufacturing. The social and economic habits of a nation depend largely upon climate. It was thought for a time that slavery in the South was a "temporary necessity" but with the realization of the adaptibility of the system it became an "economic necessity."

Regardless of the favorable climatic conditions and the agricultural pursuits so well adapted to slave labor, the institution after all did not grow by leaps and bounds as is so often asserted. So gradual, indeed, was

1. Spears, 14.
2. Records of the Columbia Hist. Soc., 11, 108.

its development and the half-hearted interest, even at times positive opposition, that the statement of the Negro historian, George Williams, that it is due to Virginia to say that slavery was forced upon her, is by no means inconsistent if applied to this period.[1] Rivalled by the indentured white servant and unsustained by any idea of an inherent good, we may wonder how it existed.[2] The only logical reason for its continuance is that it was due to the small stream of slaves that flowed into the country from the West Indies. New England ships early made voyages to the African coast, carrying rum, which they exchanged for slaves and in turn sold the slaves for sugar and molasses in the West Indies. Frequently, some of the slaves were retained and carried to the mainland as household servants.[3] Not until the signing of the Assiento in the Treaty of Utretch in 1713 was the slave population materially increased.[4]

1. Virginia's attitude toward Slavery Secession, (Munford), 15.
2. Fiske--Old Virginia and her Neighbors,178. Not much difference in the status of the slave and the white servant. "....the last was inflicted upon the indentured servant with scarcely less compunction than upon the purchased slave." DuBois--The Negro, 187, "For a long time... their freedom." Doyle--English Colonies in America, 51. MacDonald--Select Charters, No.17.
3. DuBois Suppression of the African Slave Trade in America, 184; Bruce--Econ. Hist. of Virginia, 70--77.
4. Bruce, 77. In Virginia by 1663 not over 1500 had been imported. Many of the other colonies had barely accepted slavery by this time.

There is something pitifully incongruous when we consider the devotion of the Puritans to spiritual freedom and at the same time the physical bondage in which they readily received the Negro, "as freely as any partisan that went for loot or plunder." Their actions were a direct negation of both spiritual and physical liberty. The advent of negro slavery in the North was by no means an innovation to that section. Because of the bloody deeds and treachery as experienced in night attack and ambuscade the Indian was viewed by the colonists as a child of the devil and as such fit subject for subjugation.[1] Massachusetts and Connecticut early enslaved Pequots not because of the economic advantages but rather as a means of protection and punishment.[2] The Indian, however, was a poor subject and of little value as a slave. In spite of the earnest protestations of the Puritans that the Indian through his enslavement was the recipient of a Christian civilization, servitude did not appeal to him. He was proud and rebellious and even without these traits he showed a strong aversion to work. Thus Indian slavery was a sort of indeterminate penal sentence and by no means an economic asset.

1. Daniels--In Freedoms Birthplace, 2: Channing, II, 383-5; Doyle-English Colonies in America, 359. In 1675, Elliot protested against the selling of Indians. "....the selling of soulds is a dangerous thing," said he.
2. The Connecticut law of 1650, provided that Indians might be "shipped out and exchanged for negroes as the case may justly bear."

The transition from Indian to Negro slavery was a simple process. Negro slavery existed in parts of Massachusetts at least as early as 1630,[1] and in 1638 made its appearance in Boston.[2] Perhaps the first negroes in Boston were a part of the cargo of the ship Desire, for Winthrop writes that "Mr. Pierce in the Salem ship, Desire, returned from the West Indies after seven months. He had been at Providence, and brought some cotton and tobacco, and negroes--"[3] The New England colonies became deeply interested in the slave trade and were the chief carriers in the traffic. Slavery, however, was a successful failure in the New England colonies because of the non-productivity of the soil and the severe climate. A well-to-do individual might support one slave, but a dozen would ruin him. Thus slavery in the North became a badge of aristocracy and a coveted social distinction. Burgess makes the somewhat startling statement that, "so far as the colonists themselves were responsible for the introduction of negro slavery among them, the impartial historian must place the greater blame

1. Hutchinson--Hist. of Mass., I,36. In 1630 Samuel Maverick introduced slavery.
2. Daniels--In Freedom's Birthplace, 1--"The negor has had his part in the history of Boston almost as long as his Caucasian fellow-citizen. He came into the community in 1638, only eight years after the original settlement."
3. Winthrops Journal, I, 360.

upon a Northern Colony."[1] He refers to Massachusetts. In 1641, this colony virtually legalized the holding of slaves in its "Body of Liberties."[2]

A certain irascible gentleman, Lloyd Garrison, at one time vehemently contended that the Constitution was "a convenant with death, and an agreement with hell."[3] The basis of his argument was the countenance shown slavery in the Constitution. This favoritism was expressed in three compromises which without doubt strengthened the system.[4] In the Constitutional Convention of 1787, a majority of the delegates were opposed to slavery and especially to the slave trade.[5] However, a laissez faire doctrine announced by Elsworth that "the morality and wisdom of slavery are considerations belonging to the States themselves," was accepted.

It was insisted by some that since the slave did not vote that he was not a citizen and should not be counted for the apportionment of representatives but should be considered in the levying direct taxes. The result was a compromise in which the parties split the difference and

1. Burgess--Middle Period, 41.
2. MacDonald--Select Charters, No. 17.
3. Motto on title page of the Liberator.
4. Am. Political History, Chap. V. (Johnson); Walker--Making of a Nation, 32-5.
5. Farrand--Framing of the Constitution, 148. Madison Papers. "Though the word slave is not mentioned this is the meaning... The Northern delegates owing to their peculiar scruples on the subject of slavery, did not choose the word slave to be mentioned." Elliot's Debates, IV, 176.

counted three-fifths of the slaves both in representation and direct taxation.[1]

The slave trade had by this time become an important factor in commerce.[2] The trade was at first monopolized by the "Company of Royal Adventurers," which was succeeded in 1662 by the "Royal African Company." In 1750 England threw open the trade to all her subjects with the consistent official declaration following in 1775, that "the Colonies must not be allowed to check or discourage a traffic so beneficial to the nation." Many of the colonies opposed the trade and on the surface it would appear that it was forced upon them, but their opposition was caused by overstocked markets and fear of slave insurrections. Jefferson protested against the traffic in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence but was compelled to strike out that portion, for, says he, "Our Northern brethren also ....felt a little tender under these censures, for though their people have very few slaves, yet they had been considerable carriers of them for others." [3] Doubtless the trade would have been prohibited in the Constitution but for the demands of the

1. Many states considered slaves as real estate.
2. Du Bois--Suppression of the African Slave Trade; Statesman's Manual, 190; MacDonald Select Charters, No. 27; Liv. Age, 43:368-73; Nat. Intell. Vol. XXII; Schouler, II, 142; Liberator, 27: whole No. 1358, 29, No. 1364,1372, 1374, 1375. Hart I, No. 38; Channing IV, 434-35; Ibid. Vol. XII, (Am. Nat.) 103-9.
3. Writings of Jefferson (Ford) I, 28.

slave hungry states. "No Slave Trade, No Union!" was their argument. A compromise resulted in which it was agreed that the trade should not be interfered with for twenty years and in return Congress should have control of commerce.

Prior to the Constitution a man could recover a runaway slave only through the comity of the state into which the fugitive had fled. Butler of South Carolina presented a fugitive bill during the convention. The bill provided that, "Persons held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof," could be reclaimed. Later it was argued that this law did not apply to slaves but to apprentices and persons breaking contracts of labor. The notes of the convention refute this idea.[1]

Thus the Constitution abetted slavery. Of this legislation, Du Bois writes, "It is neither profitable nor in accordance with scientific truth to consider that whatever the constitutional fathers did was right....We must face the fact that this problem arose principally from the cupidity and carelessness of our ancestors.... It was the plain duty of a Revolution based upon "Liberty" to take steps toward the abolition of slavery.....It was the plain

1. Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 9. Pinckney before the S. C. ratification convention said, "We would have made better if we could, but on the whole I do not think them bad."

duty of the Constitutional Convention, in founding a nation to compromise with a threatening social evil only in case its settlement would thereby be postponed to a more favorable time."[1]

It seems to be a weakness of the stronger when enslaving the weaker to assert, usually with a view of justifying their course, the benefits derived from the servile condition. Thus in the "True and Sincere Declaration" of 1639, it was announced with a flourish that the colonists were to "preach and baptise into the Christian Religion and, by the propogation of the Gospell, to recover out of the arms of the Devill a number of poore and miserable soules (Indians and Negro slaves) wrapt unto death in almost invicible ignorance...."[2] In the same strain, Governor Dongan of New York, 1686, was instructed, "You are also with the assistance of Our Council to find out the best means to facilitate and encourage the conversion of Negroes and Indians to the Christian Religion."[3] This idea of the religious benefits gained by the slaves was worked to death. Years later in the addresses delivered at the annual meetings of the Colonization Society, such expressions were common: "we have taken the broad ground

1. Du Bois--Suppression of the African Slave Trade, 198.
2. Spears--The American Slave Trade, 10.
3. Am. Historical Rev., Vol. XXI, 508.

that slavery has done Africa and the African race a good, a great good." "But it is the religious blessings the African has enjoyed in this country which are his greatest advantages.....if these Africans had not come to this country, probably not one of them would have ever heard the gospel";".....they are to be elevated to a high estate, to the very society of Christ and his saints in his kingdom that was to come."

Examples of this religious cant can be found alsmost without number and variety of expression as to the part played by the Providential. We hope that they were sincere. Sincere or not, such sanctimonious phrases aided materially in strengthening the slave power by giving it a religious aspect. Later the same arguments were used in securing support for the Colonization Society.[1]

1. The Old Testament was drawn upon to prove the Divine Sanction given slavery.

CHAPTER II.

Colonization a result of Manumission.

Manumission was a forerunner of colonization. Without agitation and freeing of at least a small portion of the slaves, colonization would not have been possible for the Society was primarily interested in the free negro. Manumission and abolition belong to the anti-slavery movement and while each freed the slave they were different in their methods. Abolition stood for the immediate and absolute destruction of slavery without compensation.[1] This result was to be accomplished through legislation, if possible, and with violence, if necessary. On the other hand, manumission was a much milder precedure with the same end in view. It sought to bring about, through education and example, the voluntary freeing of the slave by the master. Abolition was not realized until after the Civil War, so the only freed slaves in the South were those who had been made free through manumission.

The Church, as a whole, we might say, was antagonistic to manumission. There was little attempt on the part of the Puritans to convert the slave for it was feared "that by becoming Christians they and the Issues

1. There were many plans of abolition. Some included compensation. Garrison was not of this class.

of their bodies are actually manumitted and made free and discharged from their servitude and bondage."[1] Some realized that the relation of master and slave was decidedly incompatible with Christian ethics. Others escaped this dilemma by basing their sanction for servitude on race and color.[2] It was even asserted that the Negro was non-human and as one good lady stated it -- "you might as well baptize puppies as negroes."[3] The idea took root that if the paganism of the individual legalized his enslavement, then baptism would have the effect of freeing him. For a long time baptism was withheld from the slave because of the fear that the performance of this writ virtually manumitted him. However, other factors, especially economic, entered. The baptismal act placed the Christian master under the obligation of taking better care of his slave. Baptism was also objected to on the grounds that it made the slave proud and vicious, once he had absorbed some of the teachings of the gentle Christ. The Legislature of Virginia, in 1667, summarily, disposed of this vexatious

1. Am. Hist. Rev. Vol. 21: 504--37
2. Du Bois--The Negro, 27. "There is a modern theory that black men are and always have been naturally slaves." The slavery of the Negro has been a matter of religious and political conditions rather than racial.
3. Fiske--Old V. and her Neighbors, I, 193. Footnote gives origin of this tale.

question to the satisfaction of all when it enacted "conferring of batisme doth not alter the condition of the person as to his bondage."[1] It was quite common for the different denominations of the time to speak of slavery as a "mournful evil" and "utterly inconsistent with the laws of God", but when the subject of manumission was mentioned it was turned aside by some evasive and pious ejaculation. They seemed more concerned in adapting and making Christianity square with slavery than in encouraging manumission. William Goodell wrote "The Church knows the evil, but nevertheless, hugs it to her bosom."[2] There was one sect, however, which did not compromise with slavery and was unafraid of manumission --- the Quakers or Friends.[3]

Many of the Quakers were wealthy slaveholders in their early history and, because of the mildness of the system as it existed among them, saw no harm in it. The minutes of early yearly meetings show cautions against the system. In 1688 the Friends of Germantown, Pennsylvania, were the first to enter a protest against the "buying and keeping of negroes."[4] In 1696 the Yearly

1. Ibid.
2. Goodell--Slavery and Anti-Slavery, 148.
3. Ibid., Chaps V to XVII; Greeley I, Chap X; Sharpless--A Quaker Experiment in Government, 31--33; Sewall--Selling of Joseph; Du Bois--Supression of the Slave Trade, Chap. III.
4. Proud--Hist. of Pennsylvania, 319.

Meeting advised against "bringing any more negroes." In 1726 a law made manumission illegal without the assumption on the part of the master of a certain amount, so that the freed slave would not become a public charge. The purchase of a slave became in 1754 a matter of discipline and four years later all communicants were commanded "to set them at liberty, making Christian provision for them." Manumission was made compulsory on pain of expulsion in 1776. This last act was virtually a declaration of independence for the slaves. Between 1750--80 slaves were set free, their masters assuming the thirty pounds liability as required by law. Turner, in speaking of manumission among the Friends, writes "It was not delayed until slavery had become unprofitable, nor was it forced through any hasty violent hostility."[1]

Manumission was accomplished in several ways. The master could deliberately free his slave by a court decree or by deed or will . Frequently slaves were freed by the commonwealth because of service, as in the case of one "Will", a slave belonging to Robert Ruffin, of the county of Surrey in Virginia, who, in 1710, divulged a conspiracy."[2] It was not unusual for kind masters to

1. Turner--The Negro in Pennsylvania, Chap. VI.
2. Munford--Virginia's Attitude toward Slavery and Secession, Chaps. XVI, XVII.

permit their slaves to buy their freedom. In the large manumission was confined to the South for by 1785 emancipation had been accomplished in the Dutch and Quaker Colonies and their neighbors.[1] From 1782 to 1806 manumission was permitted without qualification, but from 1806 to 1833 the right of emancipation was restricted. Many close-fisted masters did not hesitate to free their old and infirm slaves with the result that often the freed man became a public charge. Laws requiring bonds as surety for the support of the freed negro, in case of his inability to care for himself, were passed. Laws denying the freed negro the right of domicile longer than a year operated as a check on manumission; but with the introduction of better facilities for travel, manumission became common again.

Manumission was frowned upon in the South and most of the legislation relating to it was anti in its nature. Not that the slaveholder objected to his neighbor giving up his property, if he so wished, but it was the result of manumission--the free negro--that was a thorn in the flesh Because of this antagonism the status of the freed black was anything but an enviable one. In Maryland a free negro was in danger of having his ears cut off for striking a white man, while in Kentucky for the

1. Fiske--The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America, 11, 280-6.

same offense he would receive thirty lashes, "well laid on." In North Carolina any free colored man was liable to a fine of five hundred dollars for teaching a free negro to read, and a free negro guilty of teaching one of his race was fined or whipped at the discretion of the court. In Virginia free negroes or their children could not assemble in a school for instruction. In North Carolina free negroes could not trade, buy or sell goods outside of the district in which they resided. In Mississippi every negro or mulatto unable to prove himself free could be sold into slavery.

In South Carolina a free negro who should aid a slave to escape was fined, and if unable to meet the fine, was sold into slavery. In Maryland a free negro coming into the state was fined fifty dollars for every week he remained. In the large he could not testify in court, sell certain articles, enlist in the militia and usually required a white man as a guardian. It might be added that this restricted status in no way impaired his privilege of paying taxes. "The best that even the free negro could hope" says Professor Hart, "was an inferior, imperfect and unstable status. No legal distinctions were made between the quick and the stupid, the coal-black and the mulatto, the son of a planter and the son of a field hand."[1]

1. Hart--Slavery and Abolition,(Am.Nat.23) 79. Also Chap. VI. Jay's Inquiry 31--34.

These restrictions were not the result of mere caprice or excessive race prejudice, but rather as a means of salvation. The South insisted on taking "time by the forelock", and through oppressive legislation rendering the negro harmless to its life and property. "The fear", writes Channing, "of free blacks, even in communities where the sight of a man of color was unusual, met the abolitionist at every point. The dread of a free black population was the outcome of the feeling of dislike which white people felt for the social equality which such a status seemed to imply and to the belief that the free blacks committed crimes out of all proportion to their number."[1] "The mere intent", says Garrison, "of the slaves to rise for their liberty naturally brings up the most terrible spectres of crime and mischief that the Sourthern men seem beside themselves."[2] In the early years of the nineteenth century Touissant L'Ouverture led his black army to victory against the French in Sam Domingo. It was true that the Negro race had produced but one Napoleon in centuries, but a wave of fear swept over the South. Aside from the fear of

1. Channing--Am. Nat. 12:100. Also Am. Hist. Hist. Rev. Vol. 20:346--40; Schouler 111,105, IV, 206; Liberator Vol XXVIII, No. 1447.
2. Liberator, Vol. XXVII, No. 1356

bodily harm there was the insecurity of property caused by the presence of free negroes. "It is no longer a subject of doubt," says the Richmond Examiner, "whether free negroes ought to remain in a slaveholding community. With few meritorious exceptions, they are idle, vagrant, intemperate, dishonest, indolent."[1] The following quotations show the place the freed negro held in the Southern heart. He was said to be in "a class out of which no individual can be elevated and below which none can be depressed," "addicted to crime and vice," "the caterpillars of the earth and the tigers of the human race," notoriously ignorant, ...scarcely reached in their debasement by the heavenly light; [2] " cannibals or slaves without masters." [3] Thus the manumitted negro was persona non grata to the South and as time passed his presence became more and more unbearable. It is no wonder then that, with the revival of the colonization idea, the suggestion was eagerly seized and acted upon without delay.

That colonization was a panacea to the South can best be shown by the views of the South in regard to it. "The idea", said McDuffie, "of their freed blacks remaining among us is utterly visionary, and would furnish

1. Liberator, Vol.XXVII, No.1364.(Correspondence from the Examiner)
2. Stebbins--Views of the Am. Col. Soc. 80---93190--93.
3. Liberator, Vol. XXVII, No. 1358, Book review of that title.

Dante or Milton with type for another chapter illustrating the horrors of the infernal regions."[1] The only disposition" concludes the same writer, "would be their transportation to Africa to Exterminate the natives or be exterminated by them."[2] "Plainly", said The Richmond Examiner, "there are but two methods of effecting the riddance --- that of sending all of them off, who shall elect to go, and selling those who remain into the condition of bondage."[3] The removal of the freed blacks appealed to the South as a safe and sure way of freeing itself of danger. "By removing these people, we rid ourselves of a large party who will always be ready to assist our slaves in any mischievous design they may conceive; by thus repressing the rapid increase of blacks, the white population would be enabled to reach and soon over-top then; the consequence would be SECURITY. They are in the first place to aid ourselves by relieving us from a species of population (free blacks) pregnant with future danger."[4] These and other extracts of a similar nature show the view of the South. The idea that slave property would be enhanced was not lost sight of as seen

1. Am. Hist. Leaflets, No. X, 6.
2. Ibid.
3. Liberator, Vol. XXVII. No. 1364.
4. Jay, "An Inquiry" contains numerous statements of Southern writers on the benefits of colonization. Especially Chap. II.

in the following: "The object of the Colonization Society commends itself to every class of society. The landed proprietor may enhance the value of his property by assisting the enterprise.[1] The injury they (free people of color) do to the slaveholders' property, by their influence upon his servants, would, if valued, amount to more than sufficient to convey them from us. Colonization of the free people of color will render the slave who remains in America more obedient, more faithful, more honest and consequently more useful to his master."[2] Statements of this nature could be given without limit, showing that the South considered colonization not only a good thing for the freed negro but still better for the slaveholder.

1. Stebbins--View of the Am. Col. Soc. 53.
2. Jay--"An Inquiry", 105.

CHAPTER III.

Antecedents and Organization of the Colonization Society.

The colonization scheme was by no means an innovation of the nineteenth century, but rather had its origin fully a hundred years before. We have already noted that the Quakers were the first consistently to oppose slavery and later make manumission a matter of compulsion. It is also to them that credit must be given of originating the first colonization scheme. In 1713 one of a number of resolutions pertaining to slavery contained this: "1, That subscriptions be taken of all the Masters that will set their Negros free, and of the Number of Negros so to be set free, that they may be sent to their own country."[1] While nothing definite resulted from this resolution yet, without doubt, it had its effect in producing similar plans in the minds of others. In 1762 Anthony Benezet, an ardent abolitionist, advocated that freed slaves should be educated along agricultural lines, and when it was thought that they were capable of self-support to remove them to some territory west of the Alleghanies.[2] His plan was seconded by Thomas Branagan, a reformed slave trader, of rather a dreamy, speculative nature, but a man of force and energy. In 1790 a pamphlet entitled,

1. Du Bois--Suppression of the Slave Trade, 30.
2. Locke--Slavery and Anti Slavery, 173-5.

"Plan for liberating the negroes within the United States," appeared. The writer, Fairfax, advocated the manumission of all slaves and their colonization in Africa at the expense of the government. While none of these plans materialized at the time, yet they had their value in that they kept the idea alive.

In 1773, from Newport, Rhode Island, the "notorious hot-bed of slavery," came another plan. Its author was Samuel Hopkins. His original plan was to train native Africans for missionary work in their own land, but after consultation with Rev. Styles, President of Yale, he decided upon a permanent colony. The plan was advertised, and in 1776 funds were raised and several promising negroes placed in Princeton with the view of training them for foreign missions. The Revolution interrupted the enterprise and the plan came to naught, but Dr. Hopkins did not lose courage. In 1793, before the Anti-Slavery Society of Providence, he again broached the subject, insisting that colonization should be a means, "to instruct and civilize them (freed negroes), and spread the knowledge of the Gospel among them." In 1787 the, "gifted and erratic Dr. Thornton", offered to lead colonists from Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and went so far as to publish an address to the free

negroes setting forth this offer. The project failed because of lack of funds. A few years later, Paul Cuffee, a colored man from New Bedford, Massachusetts, successfully colonized about forty of his people in Sierra Leone. Thus far all the colonization plans had been of a missionary nature, but there were those interested in colonization because of its political significance.[1]

Jefferson was an earnest advocate of colonization, because of political benefits. His idea was that "the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government."[2] While believing that emancipation and colonization went hand-in-hand, he was not in favor of the United States as the place for the experiment but rather Africa or the West Indies.[3] In 1777 Jefferson proposed to the Legislature of Virginia that it include in its revised state code a plan of colonization. He also attempted to secure a grant of territory from the Sierra Leone Company and the Portuguese government, but failed in both instances. In 1800 a well-planned slave insurrection in and about Richmond was discovered and nipped in the bud. Alarmed, the Virginian legislature of that year resolved that Governor Monroe

1. Foote--Africa and the American Flag, Chap. X; Wilson--Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, Chap. XV. See Bibliography for Chapter IV.
2. Morse--Jefferson (American Statesmen),53.
3. Randall--Life of Jefferson, II,673-4.

correspond with the President about purchasing land outside of the state where "persons obnoxious to the laws, or dangerous to the peace of society may be removed." The "persons" referred to were understood to be free negroes, although criminals could be included. No action was taken at that time but again in 1805 a resolution was drawn in the Legislature recommending that the state representatives in Congress confer with the President about the purchase of land in Louisiana for a colony. In 1808 Samuel J. Mills became interested in colonization and advocated the planting of a colony between the Ohio and the Great Lakes. During the next few years there seems to have been a change of opinion as to the location of the proposed colony for in 1816 another resolution in the Legislature of Virginia, called for the purchase of territory for a colony, "on the coast of Africa, or some other place not within any of the States, or territorial governments of the United States.."[1] Mr. Mercer, the father of the resolution, says that this resolution anticipated the American Colonization Society. A pamphlet published in Washington in 1817, in giving an

1. In looking through the secret journals of the Legislature of 1801--5, Charles Mercer came across the correspondence between Governor Monroe and Jefferson, relating to the colonization of freed negroes. It was from this correspondence that he became interested in the matter.

acdount of the formation of the Colonization Society, gives the Virginia Legislature the credit of founding it.[1] This assertion is disputed.

In the twelfth annual report of the New York Colonization Society it was said that, "the first great conception of the scheme was formed by the devout, benevolent Dr. Finley."[2] While this may be a good characterization of Dr. Finley, yet historically, as we have already seen, it is untrue. The colonization plan appealed so strongly to Dr. Finley that he decided to act upon it. With this in mind he called a meeting of the friends of the plan, which was held at Princeton. It was decided at this meeting to hold another session, and that one to be at Washington. However,before adjourning, a memorial to the Legislature of New Jersey asking that body to use its influence with Congress in furthering the project was prepared. Dr. Finley realized that this memorial would have little effect and so at once journeyed to Washington where, through the aid of his brother-in-law, Elias Caldwell, several of the members of the House and Senate became interested. This second meeting was held on the 21st of December, 1816. Justice Bushrod Washington promised to preside

1. Stebbins, 18.
2. Ibid. 13.

but was unable to be there and in his place Henry Clay was appointed. He opened the meeting by stating that the object of their gathering was, "to consider the propriety and practicability of colonizing the free people of color in the United States, and of forming a society for that purpose." He then proceeded to say that the condition of the free negroes was a peculiar one as they did not enjoy the immunities of freemen nor were they subject to the incapacities of the slave. It was impossible to amalgamate the black and white races, hence the best plan was to drain the country of them. He assured his hearers that colonization and abolition were in no wise connected. He concluded with, "can there be a nobler cause than that which, while it proposes to rid our own country of useless and perniciuous, if not a dangerous portion of its population, contemplates the spreading of the arts of civilized life, and the possible redemption from ignorance and barbarism of a benighted quarter of the globe!"[1] The half-famous John Randolph of Roanoke followed with the statements that "the colonization scheme tends to secure the property of every master, to, in and over his slaves," and, "it is a notorious fact that the existence of free negroes is looked upon

1. Stebbins, 19.

by every slave owner as one of the greatest sources of insecurity to slave property."[1] A few other speakers followed, voicing the sentiments of the first two. Resolutions were drawn which expressed the wishes of the meeting. It was held the free negroes had always been a matter of concern to the white man; that the time was ripe to further the civilization of the blacks by colonization; that the rights of man were better understood and that the government which existed for the good of man would or should take a deep interest in the project. Before adjourning, committees were appointed for the purpose of collecting information, framing a constitution and memorializing Congress.[2]

On December 28th another meeting was held at which the constitution was adopted. In the first two articles of the constitution we find the name and object of the society set forth as follows; "Art. I. This society shall be called the American Society for colonizing the Free People of Color of the United States. Art. II. The object to which its attention is to be exclusively directed is to promote and execute a plan for colonizing (with their consent) the free people of color residing in our country, to Africa, or such other

1. McMaster II, 561.
2. McMaster IV. 561.

place as Congress shall deem most expedient. And the society shall act to effect this object in cooperation with the general government and such of the states as may adopt regulations on the subject." [1]

January 1, 1817, a third meeting was held at Washington at which officers of the society were chosen, Bushrod Washington being elected the first president. [2] At the same time steps were taken for definite action. A memorial was presented to Congress in which that body was solicited, "to aid with the power, the patronage and the resources of the country, the great and beneficial object of their institution." The memorial also pointed out that the restrictions placed by the states upon the free negro led to his migration from one state to another, thus transferring the evil of his presence. It asked that "some salubrious and fertile region, " be purchased for a colony and prayed that the Society might aid Congress in the enterprise. The memorial was read by Randolph and after its reading was referred to the Committee on the African Slave Trade. [3]

1. Stebbins, 20; Jay, 11.
2. Stebbins,19. Schouler III, 139-43. "a little sharp- faced gentleman with only one eye, and with snuff all over his face. " an amiable little man," who sold his family slaves in lots to be sent down to Louisiana.
3. Annals of Congress, Vol. 30, 481--3; 639.

The Committee on the African Slave Trade approved the memorial. In replying to the momorialists the Committee asked and answered three questions. It inquired as to the advisability of founding the colony in the United States and decided that it should not be located here. The ideal place for the experiment, as the Committee saw it, was Africa. The question was asked as to the expediency of requesting Great Britian to receive the colonists in Sierra Leone. This third and last query was answered by a number of resolutions. It was resolved that the president negotiate with all the countries in which there was a United States minister, relative to the abolition of the slave trade, and also to seek permission to carry colonists to Sierra Leone and, if refused, to purchase a tract on the African coast.[1]

Believing that, "Faith without works is dead," the Society at once took steps to carry out the objects for which it had pledged itself. The first need was to secure funds with which to complete the organization and at the same time start the work of colonization. Auxiliary societies were formed in the states but it was not until a later date that independent state societies were formed. Circulars, newspapers and speakers enlightened the public as to the great good it could do by aiding the Society.

1. McMaster IV. 563.

The missionary and philanthropic aspects of the new movement were boldly announced from the platform and press. The religious mission of the new society found vent in such expressions as: "In the providence of God, this society was called into being. Like an angel from heaven, a divinely chosen messenger of mercy, it carried toward Africa the balm of the Gospel"; "It would illuminate a CONTINENT. It would publish the name of Christ on the dark mountains of Africa and on the burning sands of the desert. It would kindle up holiness and hope among uncounted tribes."[1]

Unquestionably many good and sincere men were engaged in the work, but from some subsequent acts we are forced to conclude that much of this was in our modern parlance "camouflage". The real motives of the Society, as noted, cannot be determined merely from its declarations as found in its constitution, or from the words of its members, but rather from the work and policy of the Society. Different sections of the country viewed the Society in various lights. The General Assembly of Ohio considered that, through colonization, emancipation would follow and recommended that Congress declare all children of slaves free, when they attained the age of

1. Stebbins. 171.

twenty years, providing they should consent to be colonized. Delaware thought colonization essential to the prosperity of the country. New Jersey approved of the Society and offered to bear her share of the burden, while Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland and Vermont contributed at various times to its support.[1] Location determined largely the attitude towards the Society as also the motives ascribed to it and its work. In the North the religious beneficence of the organization was emphasized, while in the South it was regarded as a guard to life and property and founded for that ultimate purpose.[3]

1. McMaster, V. 304.
2. De Bow 26; 416--23. A discussion of circumstances that favored colonization at this time.

CHAPTER IV.

The Colonization Society in Africa.

In November of 1817 two Agents set sail for the western coast of Africa, where they hoped to find a location suitable in climate and topography for the enterprise. The emissaries were Samuel J. Mills, a former missionary, and Ebenezer Burgess, a clergyman. Enroute to Africa they visited England and attempted to obtain admittance to Sierra Leone, but that colony was closed to the American negro.[1] Upon their arrival in Africa the two agents spent some time in exploration and finally decided that the preferable location was a small island, Sherboro, about sixty miles southeast of Sierra Leone. They sought an interview with two native kings pursuant to the purchase of the island. These "lords of the land" refused to negotiate or, as they termed it, to take part in a "palaver" unless a jar of rum for each was forthcoming. Evidently, the agents in spite of what scruples they may have had in making such a gift considered that the end justified the means and met the demands of the chiefs. The agents' interpreter assured the natives that "these people come quiet -- no war, no fight -- if our people bad, no musket

1. Sierra Leone founded May 9, 1787, by Granville Sharpe.

fired, but regular palaver."[1] "Regular palaver" seemed to appeal to them and the sale was finally closed. A sad incident marred the return voyage of the agents -- the death of Mr. Mills.[2]

Having secured the requisite territory for the colony, the next thing was to find the colonists. A peculiar situation arose at this time in regard to the disposition of the Africans taken from a captured slaver. The law of 1807, while it forbade the further importation of slaves, did not make a provision as to the disposal and care of negroes seized from the slave traders. Thus each state was left at liberty to dispose of such negroes as it saw fit. Georgia saw fit to sell them. May 4, 1819, a public sale of captured blacks was advertised to take place at Milledgeville. Prior to this, 1817, Georgia offered to give all such blacks to the Society providing that it would pay the cost of exportation and maintenance in this country. Immediately upon the publication of this sale, Bishop William Meade was sent by the Society to secure the release of the negroes. It seems that the Society was short of funds for the release of the blacks was granted with the understanding that it reimburse the state at some future date. Hence the sale was postponed

1. Stebbins, 168. Leisure Hour VII, 79.
2. McPherson--Liberia, 499. McMaster IV, 564.

until the redemption money could be raised. In the meantime, George Washington Parke Custis offered a small island which he owned as a place of refuge for the negroes until they were shipped to Africa. This incident of the Georgian negroes was the occasion for legislation very favorable to the Society.[1]

Mercer was indignant at the procedure of Georgia in her sale of recaptured negroes. After the affair at Milledgeville he worked diligently and was successful in securing an act in Congress, March 3, 1819, which authorized the President to transport such negroes, mulattoes or persons of color as might be seized under the act for the suppression of the slave trade; to send an agent to Africa to receive such as are taken from slavers, and appropriated $100,000 to carry out these designs.

In accord with the Act of March 3, 1819, President Monroe appointed a government agent, Rev. Samuel Bacon. He also received the appointment of colonial agent, having associated with him as agents of the Society, John P. Bankson and Dr. Samuel A. Crozer.[2] The President took special care to point out that the Government agency was separate frpm the Society. "You are not", said he,

1. McMaster IV, 565.
2. Foote, 113.

"to connect your agency with the views or plans of the colonization Society with which, under the law, the Government of the United States has no concern." [1] Also, the agent was cautioned "to exercise no power founded on the principles of colonization." [2] Subsequent history shows that the Society and the Government were virtually one in the enterprise.

On the 6th of February, 1820, it was announced that the Elizabeth, which had been chartered by the Society, lay at the foot of Liberty Street, New York, ready "to receive on board such free blacks recommended by the Society as might be required for the purpose of the agency." [3] About $33,000 had been raised to defray the expenses of the expedition and it was hoped that a large number of negroes would apply for admission, but such was not the case. On February 6, 1820, the Elizabeth--the Mayflower of Liberia--with but eighty-eight emigrants sailed from New York harbor. [4]

1. Statesman's Manual, 481-2. De Bow 27: 58-9. This act was proclaimed as the "grossest and then unprecedented fraud on the treasury", because of the great liberty taken by Monroe in its execution. The Act did not concede the right to build houses, teach, etc., but merely to receive recaptured slaves and free negroes.
2. Statesman's Manual, 481-2.
3. McPherson, 501; McMaster IV, 566. DeBow 27:59. "A wagon, several wheelbarrows, plows, iron-work for a saw and grist mill, a fishing seine and a variety of farming implements" were taken along.
4. The Society was opposed by the free negroes. See Chap. VII of Thesis.

The Elizabeth was convoyed by the Cyane, a United States sloop-of-war. A few days out from port the Cyane left the Elizabeth but later joined the emigrant ship at Sierra Leone. The stay here was necessarily short for the English showed a hostile spirit to the colonists.[1] From Sierra Leone they sailed direct to Sherboro where they were received by a small colony of blacks under the leadership of Rev. John Kizel.[2]

Unforseen difficulties soon confronted the agents of the colony. Their confidence in Kizel received a severe jolt when they discovered he had given them impressions of the island which were overdrawn. The people were loud in their complaints, petty thefts occurred and the fever broke out among them. About twenty-five of the emigrants, including Bacon and Lieutenant Townsend of the Cyane, died of the fever.[3] To add to their woes the natives, forgetting their promises to Burgess and Miller, refused to give up a foot of their territory. The colony was saved from utter destruction by Daniel Croker, a colored man of strong personality, who guided the colonists back to Sierra Leone.[4]

1. Boston Weekly Messenger, Vol. X, 2--D.
2. Kizel was a South Carolina slave. During the Revolution he had joined the English and later led a number of his countrymen to Africa.
3. Foote, 114. Bacon is reported to have said, "I came here to die, and anything better than death, is better than I expected."
4. McPherson, 501.

The following year Ephraim Bacon, a brother of Samuel Bacon, and John B. Winn, representing the Government, together with the Society's agents, Messrs. Andrews and Wiltberger, sailed from Norfolk in the brig Nautilus for Africa. About forty emigrants accompanied them. They landed at Freetown, Sierra Leone, where they collected the members of the first expedition and settled them at Fourah Bay.[1] In the meantime Bacon explored the Grain Coast of Guinea in quest of a better location for the colony than Sherboro Island had been. The Grain Coast was a high and healthful region far better adapted for colonization than the former site. Cape Mesurado was selected by Bacon as an ideal location. His negotiations with the natives ran smoothly until he insisted that the terms of sale include the abolition of the slave trade when the conference came to an abrupt end. The natives at once became suspicious and absolutely refused to have any further transactions with the agents when the slave trade was impaired.

Bacon, discouraged and disgruntled, returned to the United States. Winn died of the fever and Wiltberger left in charge abandoned the island.[2] Thus the

1. Leisure Hour Vol. 7,94. Through the kindness of Bottled Beer, King of Basaa Cove, they were permitted to settle in the capitol city, Jambo-town.
2. McMaster IV, 567.

Society had twice failed to found a permanent colony.

In 1822 Dr. Ayres was appointed colonial agent and physician. Shortly after his arrival the United States schooner Alligator dropped anchor at Freetown. Her commander, Captain Stockton, had received orders from the Government to cooperate with the Society at Sierra Leone.

Ayres, Captain Stockton and seven of the emigrants explored the coast and landed near Cape Mesurado on the 12th of December. They went forward armed with "a demijohn of whiskey and some tobacco", which convinced the natives that no hostility was then intended. The agents insisted that King Peter, the Potentate of that region, should sell them the Cape and two small islands which lay in the mouth of the Mesurado River.[1] The King seemed indisposed to part with the Cape. "If any white man settle there", said he, "King Peter would die and his woman cry a plenty."[2] A few days later a second second "palaver" was held at the residence of the King. The King asked them directly, "What you want that land for?" They explained the proposed colonization of

1. The colonists were fond of naming sites after historical landmarks in America. One of these islands was called the Plymouth of Liberia.
2. Foote, 116; McPherson, 502.

the Cape. Hardly had they completed their explanation when one of the King's men stepped forward and accused them of kidnapping and slaying the son of the King of Bassa; another charged Captain Stockton with assisting in the capture of a slaver on which the accusor had worked. The outcome of the whole affair looked exceedingly gloomy, if not actually dangerous for the agents, but the coolness of Captain Stockton saved the day.[1] By means of flattery and threats he pacified the King and his people. After some delay the land was finally purchased.[2] The deed to the sale states that the chiefs" are fully satisfied of the pacific and just views of said citizens" and bears the marks of King Peter, King George, King Zoda, King Long Peter, King Governor, King Jimmy and the signatures of Stockton and Eli Ayres, M. D.

Captain Stockton left the coast, first placing Lieutenant Hunter in command of a schooner. The schooner proceeded to Sierra Leone and picked up the working men

1. Leisure Hour 7:94.
2. Eclectic 19:122-4. The price paid consisted of #1 musket, 1 box of beads, 2 hogsheads of tobacco, 1 cask of gunpowder, 6 bars of iron, 10 iron pots, 1 dozen knives and forks, 1 dozen spoons, 6 pieces of blue baft, 4 hats, 3 coats, 3 pairs of shoes, 1 box of pipes, 1 keg of nails, 3 looking glasses, 3 pieces of kerchiefs, 3 pieces of calico, 3 canes, 4 umbrellas, 1 box of soap, 1 barrel of rum. This amounted to about one hundred dollars.

among the colonists. These disembarked at Perservance Island, the smaller of the two islands lying in the mouth of the Mesurado. The attitude of the natives was anything but reassuring, in fact, they crowded about the newcomers with threats and menaces. The hostile actions of the natives were due to their objection to the sale of the land to a people who would doubtless interfere with the slave trade. The King, who was in danger of losing his life, felt constrained to order the colonists to leave the country. Dr. Ayres, however, succeeded in pacifying the irate kings and in securing from them a beneficial concession. Perservance Island lacked wood, water and any means of adequate shelter. The colonists were permitted to cross to the mainland and there built a number of comfortable dwellings. Shortly after their removal to the mainland and during a temporary absence of Dr. Ayres, the colony nearly met its Waterloo.[1]

A small slaver which had been captured by the English ran into port for water and during the night her cable broke and she drifted ashore not far from Perservance Island. The natives seized the disabled slaver. The English captain resisted this attempt to seize his prize. He appealed to the colony for aid. The man left in charge forgot his instructions in regard to 'entangling

1. Foote, 118.

alliances" and promptly offered assistance. Two attacks were made by the natives, but the English reinforced by the colonists experienced no difficulty in defeating them with the loss of an English sailor and a colonist.[1]

The part played by the colony was unfortunate. The natives, enraged and exasperated by this interferance with their right of salvage and the colony's antagonism to the slave trade, decided to extirpate the colony. Thus on Dr. Ayres return he found the colony in a state of seige.[2] Because of this critical state of affairs, Dr. Ayres advised the abandonment of the colony, but Mr. Wiltberger opposed the suggestion. At this particular time the colony was saved through the efforts of Elijah Johnson, a colored man from New York.[3]

In the meantime the natives adopted a deceitful policy. Appearing to be friendly and conciliated they managed to get Dr. Ayres in their power and held him a prisoner, as a guarantee of the colonists removal from the country. He promised to remove the colony but he was able to convince them of the impossiblility of

1. Foote, 119; McMaster IV. 567.
2. McPherson, 502.
3. Foote, 120; McPherson 502.

the immediate removal for want of a vessel.

At the suggestion of a friendly chief, Ba Caia, Dr. Ayres appealed to King Boatswain for aid. King Boatswain was a man of remarkable personality and was held in almost superstitious dread by the coast tribes. Upon his arrival he called a meeting of the chiefs and also sent for the agents to come. He decided that the claims of the colonists were valid and in parting said to them, "I promise you protection. If these people give you further disturbance send for me, and I swear, if they oblige me to come to quiet them, I will do it by taking their heads from their shoulders, as did I old King George's on my last visit to the coast to settle disputes.[1]" Both parties seemed content with this display of justice and apparently acquiesced; but the matter was by no means closed, for no sooner had the fear of King Boatswain been removed than the natives took up the quarrel. The Dey tribe of which King Peter had been ruler realized that a most dangerous enemy had been received among them. They felt that the slave trade and its profits were in jeopardy and that the extermination of the colony was the only means of allaying the danger. A call for a general

1. Foote, 121; Leisure Hour 7:94.

convention of the chiefs, made by the agents, was responded to by seventeen kings and thirty-four half kings. They met and decided upon the boundary of the colony. A consequence of this convention was the taking of formal possession of Cape Mesurado, April 28, 1822, and the definite establishment of the colony.

CHAPTER V.

Founding of the Commonwealth of Liberia.

Toward the close of 1822, Rev. Jehudi Ashmun and his wife, together with thirty-seven emigrants arrived in the brig Strong. Ashmun found the colony in a desperate condition. The belligerent natives were again preparing to attack the settlement with the hope of wiping it out. The colonists were poorly armed and there were no fortifications. The rainy season set in and with it the fever, and in a short time only one man of the colony was not on the sick list. With what means at his command Ashmun hastened to erect fortifications and prepare for the attack. After some delay, because of the visit of King Boatswain and the brig Strong, the natives commenced their attack. Had their greed for plunder not gotten the better of them they could have easily destroyed the settlement, but in stopping to pillage the natives gave the colonists time to rally. A second attack was repulsed and shortly after the arrival of a British colonial schooner, Prince Regent, insured their safety.[1]

During this period, 1823, the colonists were in great need. Many had grown indolent and improvident,

1. McMaster IV, 568-9; McPherson 502-4; Foote, 125-28; Living Age Vol. 30,261-2; Chamb. J. Vol. 15; 395-7; Ec. Mag. Vol. 29; 124-6.

with the result that the rainy season found them without sufficient provisions or shelter. Providence again intervened in their behalf in the form of the Cyane, which arrived in March from the United States. Captain Spence fitted out a schooner to cruise near the Cape and render aid to the colony.[1] His work was cut short by the appearance of the fever on board the Cyane. Before the ship could withdraw from the danger zone several of her crew died of the fever.[2]

In the month of May, Dr. Ayres arrived from the United States with sixty emigrants. He had been appointed government and colonial agent. With the arrival of Ayres, Ashmun was informed that he was relieved of all authority and that the bills which he had drawn for the needs of the colony were dishonored by the Society. This placed him in an embarrassing position. Shortly after his arrival, Dr. Ayres was compelled to leave because of ill health. Had Ashmun been of a revengeful nature he could have withdrawn his support, and the already disorganized colony would have fallen of itself. Fortunately for the colony, he was of a different type, and instead of disregarding its need he offered his assistance. A serious infection

1. Boston Weekly Messenger, Vol. X. No. 1, b.
2. Foote, 128; McPherson, 304; DeBow, Vol.27; 593.

of discontent spread among the colonists. Dr. Ayres on his arrival had surveyed the town and redistributed the lots with the result that those who did not receive their former holdings were dissatisfied. At the same time about twelve men refused to work because of a rule made by the Society that any emigrant who received rations from the public store must in return work two days for the colony. There was a riot at the store house in which the malcontents seized and carried rations to their homes, but later an appeal to their patriotism resulted in the restoration of peace. The affair was by no means closed for the disaffected sent letters home charging Ashmun with tyranny, and when he withdrew to the Cape Verde Islands because of his health he was charged with deserting his post. Much to the discredit of the Society these reports were believed, and an appeal was made to the government to investigate.[1]

Rev. R. R. Gurley, secretary of the Society and Commandant Skinner left the United States on the schooner Porpoise in June and reached the Cape Verde Islands shortly after Ashmun's arrival. The result of their investigation

1. Foote, 130-1; McPherson, 505.

was the exoneration of Ashmun, and a report to the Society praising his conduct and administration of the colony.[1] Dr. John Peaco, had been appointed agent by the society but with the receipt of this report his appointment was modified and he was made a colonial agent to take charge in case of, "the absence, inability, or death of Mr. Ashmun." As a preventive of future disturbance the commission drew up a constitution in which for the first time the colonists were given charge of their own affairs, but the Society retained the right of veto and a preponderance of authority in the general conduct of the government. At this time the name of Liberia was given to the colony at the suggestion of Robert Harper of Maryland, and the settlement was christened Monrovia in honor of President Monroe.[2]

During Ashmun's administration some important changes had taken place. Schools and churches were erected. The tribes had become less hostile and were brought more under the colony's jurisdiction. Several nearby slave factories were destroyed and eight new settlements were established. In July, 1828, Mr. Ashmun was seized with the fever and returned

1. Boston Messenger, Vol. X, 49 b.
2. McPherson, 506; Foote, 132-3

to the United States with the hope of recovery, but died shortly after landing.[1]

For a number of years following the death of Ashmun the colony was in a state of confusion. This was due to the rapid succession of agents.[2] The continual change in policy as introduced by each agent kept the colony in a state of unrest. A few events of interest occurred during this period. In 1828, the colonial paper, The Liberia Herald, was first issued. A war in 1832, with the Dyes, ended in victory for the colony. The stream of immigrants pouring into the country during this period led the natives to believe that the rice crop had failed in America and called forth the suggestion that word be sent to have more rice planted or "black man will have no place for set down."

It was during this period that a strong movement toward state colonization was started. At the organization of the Society branch societies were formed, but these were in no way separate from the main society. Later societies were formed independent of the American society. In many cases these independent societies were aided by the states

1. Foote, 121-2
2. Ibid. 141-4

in which they were organized. As time passed these independent societies either united with the American Society or surrendered their colonies to Liberia. By 1837 the New York Society had founded a colony at Bassa Cove, the Mississippi Society at Greenville, and the Maryland Society at Cape Palmas. The latter was very successful in its colonization. There was considerable friction between these societies with the result that they were at the mercy of their enemies.[1]

The man who not only saw the need of unity but who set about to realize it was Thomas H. Buchanan, who, in 1836, had reached Africa as an agent of the Pennsylvania and New York Societies.[2] As a result of the work of Buchanan, a committee was appointed which met at Washington. At this meeting it was decided that in the future no white man could own land in Liberia; suffrage should be granted only to adult males, and citizenship should be accorded only to people of color. A constitution was drawn which provided that the territory of the societies should be divided into two provinces, thus destroying the diverse political interests of the colonies. The Society in America

1. State legislation concerning the societies; Md. J. of House of Delegates 1854; 310; Ibid. 1858, Doc.F.Pa. J.H. of Rep. 1827, 653. Ibid 1851,42, 378-1859,64.
2. Leisure Hour, Vol. 7. 109-10.

retained the right to veto all legislative acts of the local bodies. In 1839 Buchanan landed with the new constitution and subsequently its adoption by all but the Maryland Colony.[1]

Buchanan was appointed by the Society as the first governor of the new "Commonwealth of Liberia." He established a strong and efficient government and carried on an agressive campaign against the slave trade.[3] He called the attention of the United States to the use made of the American flag in the slave trade.[3] He established alms-houses with manual labor schools attached; put a stop to intertribal warfare among the natives and induced many of the native chiefs to become citizens. Sept. 3, 1841, he died from an attack of the fever. He was the last white man to act as the official head of the colony.[4]

The Society chose as Buchanan's successor a colored man, Joseph Roberts. In 1843 he called a convention of the chiefs and kings of the northern and western districts. As a result of the convention, rules were drawn for the guidance of the tribes. Inland expeditions, for the purpose of determining the resources

1. Foote, 150-3; Baker, 361-3; McPherson, 507.
2. Leisure Hour, Vol. 7; 109-10.
3. Foote, 153.
4. Ibid, 153-66; Baker 363-3; McPherson, 507.

of the country and to impress the tribes with the strength of the colony were made. Important native trade centers were opened. [1]

About this time, 1843, a dispute with England brought home to the Society the peculiar position of its progeny in the eyes of international law. The colonial schooner, John Seyes, in enforcing a tariff law made by Liberia, was seized by the British and confiscated in the Admiralty Court at Sierra Leone. The English inquired as to the relationship of the colony to the United States. Mr. Upshur, Secretary of State, replied that the American Government considered Liberia as having just claims to the friendship of all Christian nations but since it was in no way subject to American jurisdiction, the United States would not attempt to settle any of its difficulties.[2] The anomalous position of the Liberians was clearly comprehended in that, "they did not constitute an independent people, for their governor was appointed by the Colonization Society, an organization of private American citizens. They were nothing more or less than a private individual enterprise occupying a large territory purchased from the

1. Foote, Chap. 17.
2. Foote, 170; Am. J. Int. L. Vol. IV. 537; Ibid. Sup. 214.

native owners of the soil, over which no sovereign government claimed or exercised jurisdiction."[1] The Society realizing that neither the colony nor itself had any standing in the law of nations, decided the wisest course would be to grant the Liberians their freedom. The Society advised the Liberians to vote on the question of self-government.[2] Following the suggestion the question was submitted to a popular vote and was carried by a large majority. A convention held July 26, 1847, adopted a Constitution and a Declaration of Independence.[3]

1. Am. J. Int. L. Vol. III, 960.
2. Am. J. Int. L. Vol. IV, 538.
3. Leisure Hour, Vol. 7; 111. The Declaration of Independence written by Simon Greenleaf, LLD of Law, Harvard. The flag adopted was one star and stripe. Motto, "Liberty brought us here." For a text of Declaration see Chr. Examiner, 175; 184-5.

CHAPTER VI.

Permanent Results of Colonization.

Roberts, the first president of the little commonwealth, early sought its recognition by foreign powers. In 1848 he visited England where he was successful in securing a commercial treaty and a loan of two thousand pounds with which to buy the disputed territory lying between Liberia and Sierra Leone.[1] He was equally successful in France where he was offered two or three gunboats to "promote the interest of humanity upon the coast of Africa, "i.e., destroy the slave trade.[2] The nation above all others, the United States, which we would naturally have expected to recognize the black republic, refused. It was not until 1862, when a commissioner and consular-general were sent, did our government officially recognize Liberia. However, during these years the government did not withdraw its sufpport from the Colonization Society.[3]

The history of the country during the years immediately following is a record of petty wars with inland tribes and campaigns against slave factories.

1. National Intelligencer, No. 7168.
2. Ibid. An account of Roberts in France given in a letter from Gerard Ralston to Elliott Cresson, Esq.
3. Am. J. Int. L.IV. 539. Du Bois, The Negro, 70-- "The United States, not wishing to receive a Negro minister, did not recognize Liberia until 1862." The real reason was the bitter feeling in Congress over the slavery question.

Aided by the English, French and a United States sloop-of war, the Liberians won a bloodless victory at New Cesters, a notorious slave center. This victory resulted in the annexation of the district. In 1857 an event of considerable importance transpired when the Maryland Colony applied for admission in the republic.[1] This colony was the strongest of the settlements founded by state societies and its addition to the republic added greatly to the strength of the latter. In 1870 the country was on the verge of a civil war. Edward James Roye, who was elected president that year, had a mania for internal improvements, and in his favor negotiated a loan in London. The amount which was $500,000 was not objectionable but the terms of the loan were. After fees, commissions, etc., had been met only $200,000 reached Monrovia. The prophecy was freely made that England would absorb the country as a recompense; but the real crisis was to follow. It was difficult to detect anything accomplished by what little of the loanthat had slipped through the hands of the London financiers. Roye sought to stem the criticism by suggesting a constitutional amendment to lengthen the term of the president and members of the legislature. This amendment was twice

1. McPherson, 581; Jay,87-94.

presented and defeated but Roye declared that it had carried and maintained that his term of office did not expire until 1874. At the same time he forbade the election then due. The election, however, was held, and Roberts, the "epitome of Liberian history," was elected by a large majority. A convention at Monrovia in October, 1871, drew up a Manifesto in which the foreign loan was denounced as contrary to law and a provisional government was established. The opposition forces to Roye deciding that impeachment was too slow a procedure, seized and threw him into prison. This coup' d' etat ended the affair and with the inauguration of Roberts in 1872, the matter was closed.[1]

During these years France and England vied with each other in seizing Liberian territory. France in particular was a "thorn in the side of Liberia." In 1892, she politely appropriated a narrow strip of Liberian territory. In 1866 English traders settled in territory purchased by Liberia from the native chiefs and refused to recognize Liberia. A war with the natives in this region resulted in the loss of English property, and Liberia was held liable for damages. Thus the English, after all, admitted her jurisdiction. In 1871 Lord

1. McPherson, 533-37.

Granville induced Roye to agree to a boundary settlement which would have meant a great loss to Liberia. The Liberian Senate refused to ratify such a settlement and through the diplomacy of J. J. Roberts the issue was avoided. At the beginning of the twentieth century England intimated to Liberia that she had better set her house in order or she would disappear. France in particular was a "thorn in the side of Liberia." In 1892 she politely appropriated a narrow strip of Liberian soil. She asserted that the Liberian occuplation was ineffective and that the natives of that region desired French protection.[1] Although there was some truth in these assertions yet her action was inexcusable. It seemed to the distracted Liberians that their territory would be lost to the French and their government to the English. Their only salvation was the United States.

Two reasons moved the Liberians to seek the aid of the United States. The first and no doubt the chief was the feeling of kinship and the second, that the United States had shown increasing interest in the little republic. In the treaty of 1862 the United States promised to Liberia protection from the aborigines.[2]

1. Am. J. Int. L. Vol. IV. 541-2.
2. Ibid. Vol. III, 961.

In 1843 Webster, Secretary of State, wrote that the United States was disposed to befriend Liberia. [1] As a result of the French intrigue, President Cleveland in 1885 announced that it was the "moral right and duty of the United States to assist", Liberia as she was an "offshoot of our system".[2] Protests of the United States against the French aggressions had been made during these years but it is a question as to their value.[3] With the visit of the Liberian Commission in 1908, it seemed that if a "square deal" was to obtained for ther that it must be through action and not words.

The Liberian Commission asked a guaranty "of the territorial and political integrity of Liberia." This was deemed impracticable by the United States but the plea that assistance be given in the administration of Liberian affairs was considered feasible. In his report to the President, the Secretary of State pointed out that our duty was not ended by unloading the negroes on the coast and that because of the lack of knowledge of self-government, there was real danger that order

1. Ibid. Supp. Vol. IV. 211.
2. Foreign Relations, 1886, Vol. VII. 298.
3. Ibid, 1887, p. 291; 1893,p. 166-7; Harrison Annual Message. For. Relations 1893, 189; Moore V. 766.

would not be maintained in Liberia. He also suggested sending " a commission of three experienced and judicious Americans" to examine and report conditions in Liberia.[1] In recommending the commission in 1909, President Roosevelt said, "The relations of the United States to Liberia are such as to make it an imperative duty for us to do all in our power to help the little republic which is struggling under such adverse conditions."[2] Congress appropriated $20,000 for the commission and its personnel was selected. The commission, composed of both white and black members, sailed April 24, 1909.[3]

The arrival of the Commission was a gala day in Monrovia. The address of welcome was delivered by the mayor of the town after which they were conducted to the Executive Mansion followed by the citizens in their "varicolored costumes of dress and undress." "I have never seen," writes Mr. Scott, a colored member of the commission, "even among the members of my own race in the South, in their moments of wildest rejoicing, anything to exceed the feeling manifested by these people

1. Am. J. Int. L.Vol. III, 961-3. Senate Doc. 666.60 Cong. 2 Sess.
2. Ibid. 1. Sess.
3. Ind. 67, 403-7; Nat. Geo. 21; 719 ff.

in their expressions of gratitude and good will to the American Government."[1] One old woman, he relates, caused considerable mirth among the white members of the commission, by shouting, "Welcome home, welcome, welcome home, all of you." The Commission visited various parts of the country and made a study of the departments of government.

The Commission was impressed with the imitation of American ways. Such terms as Senate, Executive Mansion, Star and Stripes, President, together with the names of places as Virginia, Maryland County, Baltimore, Lexington, etc. were used by the Liberians. The houses are built after the southern style.[2] while the greater part of their books, papers, clothing, etc., are from the United States. Aside from this American spirit which seemed to prevail everywhere, the Commission was pleased with the general conduct of the people. They are law-abiding and with them profanity seems to be a "lost art." "The Monrovian", says Forbes, a negro educator, "may not be a paragon of virtue and sobriety, but he is certainly a decent citizen.[3] The findings

1. Ind. 67; 405.
2. Sir H. Johnston in Smithsonian Report, 1905, says; "leading characteristics of American Liberians are their love of buildings and their remarkable politeness.
3. Nat. Geog. Vol. 21; 719 ff.

of the Commission as to the economic and political situation of the country can best be shown by a brief outline of these conditions as they are today.

The area of Liberia is about 45,000 square miles of which a large part is forest,-- the culmination of the West African forest. The country as a whole is hilly and not marshy. The soil is very rich.[1]

The climate,because of the nearness to the Equator is, of course, tropical, and with a heavy rainfall which takes up a large part of the year. It is noteworthy that in spite of this tropical climate there are few poisonous insects. It requires so little effort to secure a livlihood there that the Liberian has become indifferent to everything but his immediate wants.[2]

Of 2,500,000 people about 12,000 are Americo-Liberians and 50,000 are classed as civilized coast negroes. The inland tribes are warlike and in the central regions of the country cannibalism is not uncommon. In later years the Liberians have begun to intermarry with the "bush niggers" with the result that a stronger race is being produced. The Liberians speak English but the tribes in the hinterland have several

1. De Bow, Vol. 27; 336.
2. Smithsonian Report, 1905, 247 ff.

languages which makes communication with, and an appreciation of each other difficult. [1]

In her governmental machinery Liberia patterned after the United States. This was due, of course, to the influence of the Colonization Society. The President and Congress is a prototype of ours.[2] The Cabinet is composed of seven members who may be removed by the President or a two-thirds vote of the Legislature. The S preme Court has three judges.[3] The country is divided into districts over which are placed governors. These districts and some of the inland tribes have representatives in Congress. Suffrage is based on a small property qualification and good negro blood. In 1847 there were two parties, the Whigs and Republicans, but the latter fell into disrepute with the result that a nomination on the Whig ticket was equivalent to election. In 1911 the venerable Elijah Johnson formed a new party known as the National Union Party. However, party life is unknown for want of an issue.[4]

1. Ibid. Open Court, Vol. 27; 162-8; Statesman's Year Book, 1910 p. 998; Cur.Lit. Vol. 47: 506-8.
2. Statesman's Year Book, 1910:998.
3. England insisted that these men receive a higher salary and be better read in the law.
4. Statesman's Year Book, 1917; Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Vol. V. 215-17.

Considerable success has attended the missionary and educational enterprises in the country. The Protestant missions and churches predominate. Two Catholic missions have been established. A majority of the inland tribes are followers of the Mohammedan faith. Mission schools have taken the place of the goverbment schools. In 1917, 3,000 out of 4,000 pupils were enrolled in the mission schools. At Monrovia there is at present a Methodist College and at Cape Palmas the Episcopalians have a High School. The government maintains a college at Monrovia, but as it has only three professors and 22 pupils it is of little value.[1]

The military arm of the country is hardly worthy of mention. The militia and Frontier Police number about four hundred men. In 1915 the country expended about $74,000 on its army. There is no navy.

The minancial and commercial affairs are in poor condition. In 1912, through the aid of the United States an International Loan of $1,700,000 was made and secured by a Custom's Rubber tax. The national debt in

1. Statesman's Yr. Bk. 1917; 1081: Pol Sci. Rev., Vol. V. 217. Le Bow, Vol. 27: 591.

in 1916 was $1,458,000. At present an American acts as financial advisor. The exports are chiefly coffee, cocoa, cotton and rubber, and in 1911 the exports amounted to but $1,337,000. In 1910 the country was connected with the United States by a cable from New York and in 1912, the French and Germans established wireless stations at Monrovia.[1]

The Commission could not help but be impressed with the need of the country. Their report to the United States was a plea for intervention. This was heeded and in the large the United States took over the affairs of the various departments of government.[2]

1. N. Am. Rev., Vol. 125:517-18; De Bow, Vol. 27:341.
2. Report of the Commission, Senate Doc. 457, 61st Cong.
   Worlds Work, Vol 20: 12872; Ind. 67: 70-3;
   " " " 18: 11981
   " " " 18: 12155

CHAPTER VII.

An Estimate Of The American Colonization Society.

In estimating the value of the Colonization Society, it is difficult to draw the line where denunciation ends and praise begins. The volumes of violent criticism hurled against the Society from the day of its organization almost to the present, contain, for all of their bias, elements of truth. It is hardly just to condemn an organization in its infancy but rather more equitable to pass judgment at the termination of its work. We are at once aware of the fact that the favorable or unfavorable of the Society depended upon which side of the Mason and Dixon line the critic stood. In the large the Society was favored in the North because it was thought that colonization would result in emancipation; in the South it was favored because it secured slave property by removing the menace of a free black population. We can divide the membership of the Society into three groups. The philanthropist, the man who wished to enhance his slave property, and the individual who was desirous of relief from a bad population without the without the expense of improving it. To go into the

views of each of these groups would require to much space, hence we shall consider only the general views.

The first critic of the Society was the object of its beneficence--the free negro. It seems that the negro was alert to the plans being made for his edification and was so ungenerous as to oppose them. January, 1817, immediately after the organization of the Society, Dr. Finley was forced to visit Philadelphia for the purpose of quieting the protests of the blacks of that city. A few extracts taken from resolutions, addresses and reports delivered by the free negroes in convention will give a good idea of their attitude.

"Resolved, That without arts, without science or a proper knowledge of government, to cast into the savage wilds of Africa the free people of color, seems to us the circuitous route by which they must return to perpetual bondage."[1]

"Resolved, That this convention views with abhorrence the unmeritedstigma cast upon the reputation of the free people of color by the promoters of the American Colonization Society. That we reject its inhuman and barbarous position of driving us from the land of our birth to one of sickness, when they are un-

1. Stebbins, 195.

willing to give us a Christian education while among them."[1]

"Resolved,That we regard the American Colonization Society as one of our worst enemies,in that,while it professes philanthropy,in one breath it says to the north,'It tends to rid us gradually of slavery,'---to the south,'Into our account the question of emancipation does not enter at all,'--to the east,'Every emigrant is a missionary,'--and to the west,'The free blacks are a nuisance,scarcely reached in their debasement by the heavenly light.'"[2]

There are exceptions to the rule and colored men were found who favored the Society. In 1850,there was formed the,"New York and Liberian Agricultural and Emigration Society," to cooperate with the American Society. This society of the blacks soon fell as it was something of a confidence game.[3] In the main the colored people were opposed to the Society and became increasingly so as the years passed.

At the time the Society was charged with furthering the slave trade. We have seen that the

1.Stebbins,195. Philadelphia,1817.
2.Ibid.,207.
3.Ibid.,101.

colonists were in continual conflict with the slavers,yet the fact remains that slavery and the slave and the slave trade did exist in the colony. It is hard to understand how the freed negro,himself a slave at one time,could enslave his black brother in the homeland. Friends of the Society insisted that the slave trade was destroyed along the Liberian coast and that no slaver dared come within a hundred miles of the settlement. An English slaver in writing to his employers,1853,says,"Tomorrow the schooner sails for New Cesters to take on board a cargo of slaves---I have been obliged to have one hundred sets of shackles made at Cape Mesurado."[1] In 1837,Rev.C. Teague,a Baptist minister in the colony,owned a depot for slaves and he was urged,"by respectable and religious Liberians to buy slaves for his household."[2] In domestic slavery the victims were called,"pawns." This form of slavery was very common in Liberia.[3]

Enemies of the Society assert that it was a failure because it not only faied to carry out of the United States a sufficient number of emigrants but that it left the free negro and took the emancipated. In other words it aided emancipation. But

1.Stebbins,159-60.
2.Ibid.,162.
3.Ibid.155-67;Jay,chap.IV.

this charge is untrue for in its first twelve years, 1818--1832,it colonized 1195 free negroes and 536 emancipated slaves. In the next thirteen years, 1832--1845,it colonized 482 free negroes and 1754 emancipated slaves. It must also be noted that the class of free negroes taken was too often the type that the South did not consider a menace. Many of the free negroes had from one-quarter to three-quarters white blood in their veins and possessed intelligence and energy. This type of negro was of value to the South.[1] Also the number of emigrants sent was so small as to be of little value in draining the country of the free black population.

Another question is in regard to the missionary nature of the Society. Some have said that its missionary work consisted in shooting a native now and then. "That multitudes of religious men belonged to the Society," says Jay,"is not denied,but the participation of such men in an object does not necessarily render it a religious object;but in what sense can the Society be termed a religious one? It is not professedly founded on any one principle of the Gos-

1.De Bow,vol.27:63-64.

pel of Christ. It exercises no one act of benevolence towards the free blacks of the country; for by transporting them to Africa it is by its own confession removing nuisances. It employs no missionary, it sends no Bible and it cannot point to a single native converted to the faith of Jesus through its instrumentality."[1] Altho religious men were connected with the Society yet we must admit from the history of the Society and the immoral conditions that were permitted to prevail in the colony, that this criticism of Jay's is not overdrawn.

The Society has been charged with furthering, emancipation, but the emancipation of slaves was denied by its members.[2] Others asserted that the Society would not interfere, "With the legal relation of master and servant,"[3] and that its object involved, "no intrusion upon property or EVEN PREJUDICE."[4] It was not until later with an influx of members from the North that the Society assumed an anti-slavery color; but to accuse the Society of being founded for the purpose of furthering emancipation and then failing to

1. Jay, 121; Chap. IV.
2. Ibid., 96.
3. Stebbins, 32
4. Ibid., 27.

live up to its creed seems to the writer unjust and unfounded.[1] So the man who looked to the Society as a means of relieving the country of the free blacks regardless of their value to the community, criticised it on this score. His contention was based on good grounds. In 1834, the Society did not send out a single emigrant. From 1847--1856, the total number of emigrants sent to Liberia was 4280, an average of 428 annually. It was estimated that the slave population was increasing at the rate of 100,000 annually so the work of the Society in exporting but 428 free negroes a year was of little value.[2] It was one of the assertions of the Society that it would keep down the slave population by exporting its excess. Jay points out that after its first eighteen years the Society had carried out of the country the increase of five and one-half days.[3] The records of the Society show that by 1868, the following classes and number of negroes had been colonized:[4]

Negroes born free	4541.
Purchased freedom	344.
Emancipated	5957.
"Freedom"	753.
From Barbadoes	346.
Unknown	62.
	11,909.

Colonized by the Maryland Society	1227.
Added by the U.S.	5722.
	6949.

1. Jay, 91.
2. Ibid., 78.
3. Helper, 182-3.
4. Am.J.Int.L.4:529.

Thus we see that the Society after all did not colonize many negroes, especially free negroes. These figures are only up to 1868, but regardless of that fact they may be taken as a fair estimate of the Society's work. Immediately after the Civil War the Society was overrun with applications for transportation to Liberia, but by 1870, there were but few applications and the Society could not raise the means to care for these. Colonization had all but ceased.[1] The South prized the negro because of his economic value. "Expatriate the negro," writes a Southerner, "and our cotton fields whiten no more," and again, "the South is most happy in possessing the negro."[2] Because of this change of attitude the negro was discouraged from leaving the country whether it was for the coast of Africa, the North or the West of the United States.[3]

In connection with the success of the Society as estimated from numbers colonized the question has been asked: Was colonization worth the price? The South considered the cost as including the loss of the slave in terms of labor. It was estimated that $50 or $60

1. Independent 68:710-11.
2. Methodist Quarterly Rev., 32:88-111.
3. Brawley, 130.

would pay the expenses of the colonist for transportation and six months residence in Liberia.[1] This,however,was a mere incidental,for in 1830,the cost of colonization averaged $1000. It is thought the Society was dependent upon charity for support,but this is not entirely true, for we have seen that the Government gave aid and many state legislatures granted large sums. Also,branch societies made contributions while the Church was continually drawn upon. Then there was the military and naval aid given the Society by the United States. It would be impossible to state the exact sum expended,but without doubt, it would total several millions. Thus viewed from a mercenary stand point,colonization was a failure.

The Society attempted to found a negro republic that should be in a way a counter-part of the United States. To say that the Society utterly failed would be untrue. It was not realized that this experiment could not be worked out in a few years. The Society lacked funds to carry on the enterprise and it was handicapped by the agitation over the slavery question. It is true that the

1.National Intelligencer,vol.XLIX,no.7157; Helper,396.

Society did not accomplish all that it expected, but it was able to prove that the negro is capable of self-government, for Liberia stands to day as a great monument of the American Colonization Society's achievment.[1]

1. At present the Society has its offices at Washington, D.C., 515, Colorado Building.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Chapters I to III.

Secondary readings:

Wilson, Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America.
Greeley, The Ameridan Conflict, vol.I, 24.
Hart, American History Told By Contemporaries, vol.I, 28,
"" " vol.II, no.102-103.
Hart, Slavery and Abolition, chap.VI.
Channing, vol.I, 115-116; vol.IV., 434-435.
" " " vol.12, (Am.Nation), 105-109.
Winsor, Spanish Explorations and Settlements in America, II, 298-331.
Winsor, United States of North America, vol.VI, 299.
Bourne, Spain in America, chap.18.
Basset, Short History of the United States, 30.
Smith, Generall Historie, Book IV, 80, 337.
Baker, History of Slavery.
Weeden, Economic and Social History of New England, II, 449.
Johnston, American Political History, chap.5.
Farrand, Framing the Constitution,
Walker, Making of a Nation, 32-35.
Rhodes, I, 18-19.
Schouler, II, 66, 142, 147.
Goodell, The Church and Slavery.
Daniels, In Freedom's Birthplace.
Hutchison, Hist.of Massachusetts, vol.I, 26, footnote.
Mary Locke, Slavery and Anti-Slavery in America.
Fiske, Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America, 288-293.
" " Old Virginia and Her Neighbors, I, 15-18; II, 117-185.
Doyle, The Middle Colonies, II, 48-49.
" " English Colonies in America, 51, 55.
Richman, Hist.of Rhode Island, 28.
Spears, American Slave Trade.
Du Bois, Suppression of the African Slave Trade In America,
Du Bois, The Negro.
Bruce, Economic History of Virginia, I, 66; II, 70-77, 129.
Munford, Virginia's Attitude Towards Slavery and Secession.
Smith, Philosophy and Practice of Slavery, Lecture X.
Turner, The Negro in Pennsylvania, chap.4.
Sharpless, A Quaker Experiment in Government, 31-33.

Sources:

Original Narritives of Early American History, 344.
Winthrop's Journal, vol.I, 260.

Madison's Papers.
Elliott's Debates,vol.I,176.
MacDonald Select Charters,nos.17,27.
The Statesman's Manual,vol.I,190.
Writings of Jefferson(Ford),vol.I,28.
Records of the Columbia Hist.Society,vol.II,108-110.
Moore,International Law Digest,vol.II,chap.8 part 2.
Garrison,Liberator,vol.27,whole no.1350,1366,1358,vol.28,
1447,vol.29,1264,1372,1374,1375.
Christian Examiner,vol.175,190.
Boston Messenger,vol.10,22-d.
American Historical Rev.,vol.XX,336-40;vol.XXI,508.
Living Age,15,67-85;vol.43,360-72.
National Intelligencer,vol.22,Dec.18,1821.
Annals of Congress,vol.38,21.
American Historiaal Leaflet,no.10.
Leisure Hour,vol.7,728.

Chapters IV to VII.

Secondary:

McPherson,Hist.of Liberia.(John Hopkins University Studies)
ninth series,487ff.
Henry Adams,Hist.of the United States,vol.III,347.
MacDonald,From Jefferson to Lincoln,66-77.
Schouler,II,147;vol.III,139-42.
Channing,I,434.
Stebbins,The American Colonization Society.
Jay,An Inquiry.
Foote,Africa and the American Flag.
Morse,Life of Jefferson,53.
Randall,Life of Jefferson,II,673-4.
MacMaster,vol.II,561:IV,563;V204.

Sources:

American Journal International Law,vol.III,961;vol.IV,541;
vol.IV,supplement,211.
Moore,International Law Digest,vol.V,766.
Foreign Relations,vol.8,288;1887,391;1889,166ff.
Annals of Congress,vol.30,481,483,639.
Smithsonian Report,1905.
Stateman's Year Book,1910,1917.

Senate Document,666,60 Cong.1st.sess.
" " " " 457,61st.
National Intelligencer,vol.49,no.7157.
Independent Mag.,vol.67,403-7;vol.68,310.
Open Court,27,162ff.
Am.Political Science Rev.,vol.5,215-17.
World's Work,18,11;20,128.
Methodist Quarterly Rew.,vol.32,88.
Chambers Journal,vol.15,395.
Eclectic Mag.vol.24-26.
National Geog.Mag.,21,719.